

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



<b>Watershed Area</b>	South Santa Monica Bay
<b>Project Name</b>	Beach Cities Green Streets Project
<b>Project Lead</b>	City of Torrance
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$2,595,000
<b>Project Type</b>	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	<b>20</b>	Unable to Score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Applicant aggregating all numbers of the 7 locations.</li> <li>Would be beneficial to see details on how the project parameters were aggregated.</li> <li>Infiltration rate is an aggregate number, but no detail to justify</li> <li>Applicant to provide additional detail and justification to claim WQ benefit.</li> </ul>
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	<b>30</b>	Unable to Score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Application claims 85<sup>th</sup> percentile capture, but there's no documentation on what the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile is.</li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	3	<b>13</b>	Unable to Score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Application claims supply benefit but there is not groundwater recharge in the beach cities. There's no information on any discharge to sewer or other supply options.</li> <li>Insufficient information to justify.</li> <li>Application notes site is located at a seawater barrier, and would contribute to the barrier.</li> <li>Applicant to provide additional detail and justification to claim supply benefit.</li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	2	<b>12</b>	Unable to Score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Community Investment</b>	5	<b>10</b>	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Would be beneficial to see more detail and justification, such as the type of trees planted.</li> </ul>
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	10	<b>15</b>	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Application notes replacement of pavement with pervious pavement, but there's no points claimed.</li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	6	<b>6</b>	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cost share appears to be just less than 50%, unclear how full points awarded. Missing \$45k somewhere.</li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	0	<b>4</b>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>TOTALS</b>	76	<b>110</b>	Unable to Score Withdrawn by Applicant	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



<b>Watershed Area</b>	South Santa Monica Bay
<b>Project Name</b>	Carson Stormwater and Runoff Capture Project at Carriage Crest Park
<b>Project Lead</b>	City of Carson
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$1,037,500
<b>Project Type</b>	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather  Part 1	20	<b>20</b>	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Applicant assumes a full capacity on trunk line at the optimal time of day; is a challenge to model. This leads to 100% capture.</li> <li>Should be above 50% capture if not at optimal time, but difficult to model this.</li> </ul>
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	<b>30</b>	30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project is claiming construction funds for O&amp;M expenditures</li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	0	<b>13</b>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Infiltration not possible at this site due to soil contamination and other restrictions</li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	12	<b>12</b>	12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assumes Reclamation Plant upgrade plans will come online to convert the detained water to future supply.</li> </ul>
<b>Community Investment</b>	5	<b>10</b>	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Would be good to know the types and placements of trees</li> <li>Unclear if the park was enhanced or put back the same; modernization of above ground amenities</li> </ul>
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	5	<b>15</b>	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>With soil contamination replacement, is this a nature-based solution; possibly included as a community investment</li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	6	<b>6</b>	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	0	<b>4</b>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>TOTALS</b>	78	<b>110</b>	78	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



<b>Watershed Area</b>	South Santa Monica Bay
<b>Project Name</b>	Portuguese Bend Landslide Complex Mitigation Project
<b>Project Lead</b>	City of Rancho Palos Verdes
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$1,875,000
<b>Project Type</b>	Dry

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	<b>20</b>	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project is more a landslide mitigation project. Applicant classifies as a dry weather project.</li> <li>A portion of the project aims to seal fissures in hillside. Is this a SCW eligible expenditure.</li> </ul>
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	20	<b>30</b>	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	0	<b>13</b>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	2	<b>12</b>	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project to capture flows and divert to sewer. Is this diversion recycled downstream? Application is only asking for design currently.</li> </ul>
<b>Community Investment</b>	10	<b>10</b>	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project classified as a dry weather project, not clear if Flood benefit can be claimed.</li> <li>Project discusses groundwater dewatering, unclear if this is a CI benefit.</li> <li>Unclear if trails are new or existing that go to the coast.</li> </ul>
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	10	<b>15</b>	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	0	<b>6</b>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	<b>4</b>	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>TOTALS</b>	66	<b>110</b>	61	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



<b>Watershed Area</b>	South Santa Monica Bay
<b>Project Name</b>	South Santa Monica Bay Water Quality Enhancement: 28th Street Storm Drain Infiltration Project
<b>Project Lead</b>	City of Manhattan Beach (Mamerto Estepa Jr., Prem Kumar, and Shawn Igoe)
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$17,620,030
<b>Project Type</b>	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	<b>20</b>	20	•
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	25	<b>30</b>	25	•
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	6	<b>13</b>	0	• Providing supply directly into a tidal zone does not qualify for supply.
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	12	<b>12</b>	0	•
<b>Community Investment</b>	2	<b>10</b>	2	• Reduction of Heat island from 3 trees does not seem justifiable.
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	13	<b>15</b>	13	•
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	3	<b>6</b>	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 23% match appears to be lower than the bar to reach 3 points.</li> <li>• Applicant noted that there's a module discrepancy of present value vs life cycle cost values.</li> <li>• Committee noted application claims monitoring and O&amp;M.</li> <li>• Does not impact score.</li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	<b>4</b>	4	•
<b>TOTALS</b>	85	<b>110</b>	67	•

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



<b>Watershed Area</b>	South Santa Monica Bay
<b>Project Name</b>	Stormwater Basin Expansion Project
<b>Project Lead</b>	City of Torrance
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$4,505,000
<b>Project Type</b>	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	<b>20</b>	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project already exists with some capacity, unclear if only delta capacity should be considered.</li> </ul>
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	<b>30</b>	30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	13	<b>13</b>	Unable to Score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unclear if all benefit is from recharge, located in Torrance near the coast. Would not reach usable groundwater. Suggest using only irrigation supply. Is recharge of the barrier eligible. More detail needed to justify if barrier benefit provided.</li> <li>Unclear again if only delta benefit is included.</li> <li>Applicant noted that this area contains a well, so project is providing benefit vs to barrier protection.</li> <li>More detail on the exact benefit is needed in application</li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	12	<b>12</b>	Unable to Score	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Community Investment</b>	5	<b>10</b>	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	10	<b>15</b>	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	0	<b>6</b>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	0	<b>4</b>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>TOTALS</b>	90	<b>110</b>	65	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Applicant to provide justification on supply benefit to the WASC.</li> </ul>

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



<b>Watershed Area</b>	South Santa Monica Bay
<b>Project Name</b>	Torrance Airport Storm Water Basin Project, Phase 2 Construction
<b>Project Lead</b>	City of Torrance
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$12,000,000
<b>Project Type</b>	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	<b>20</b>	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Applicant provided their own WQ modeling.</li> <li>Construction costs seem low.</li> </ul>
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	<b>30</b>	30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	6	<b>13</b>	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sewer diversion for downstream recycling.</li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	12	<b>12</b>	12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Community Investment</b>	2	<b>10</b>	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	0	<b>15</b>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	0	<b>6</b>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	<b>4</b>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Letters are from Cities and the County, and are for a 2016 proposition application, not for SCW project. Does not meet the intent of the strong community support.</li> </ul>
<b>TOTALS</b>	74	<b>110</b>	70	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>

# Safe, Clean Water Program

## Scoring Rubric - Fiscal Year 2021-2022



<b>Watershed Area</b>	South Santa Monica Bay
<b>Project Name</b>	Wilmington Neighborhood Greening Project
<b>Project Lead</b>	City of Los Angeles, Bureau of Sanitation and Environment
<b>Total Funding Requested</b>	\$12,183,000
<b>Project Type</b>	Wet

Scoring Section	Applicant Score	Maximum Points	Scoring Committee Score	Notes
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather Part 1	20	<b>20</b>	20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Overdesigned for the 85<sup>th</sup>, project captures for a full rainy season for irrigation purposes.</li> </ul>
<b>Water Quality</b> Wet + Dry Weather (30 pts) Part 2 Dry Weather (20 pts) Part 2	30	<b>30</b>	30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 1	0	<b>13</b>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Water Supply</b> Part 2	2	<b>12</b>	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Community Investment</b>	5	<b>10</b>	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Applicant provided very good justification for CI benefits.</li> </ul>
<b>Nature-Based Solutions</b>	11	<b>15</b>	11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 1	0	<b>6</b>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>Leveraging Funds</b> Part 2	4	<b>4</b>	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>
<b>TOTALS</b>	72	<b>110</b>	72	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>